

S/N 10/792,257

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Aaron J. Steyskal et al.

Examiner: Nguyen Ha

Serial No.: 10/792,257

Group Art Unit: 2831

Filed: March 2, 2004

Docket: 884.B85US1

Title: CAPACITOR DEVICE AND METHOD

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

The applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. The review is requested for the reason stated below:

Claims 1-5 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of DuPre' et al. (U.S. 5,880,925) in view of Greenwood et al. (U.S. 6,751,087), further including other patents in selected 35 USC § 103(a) rejections. Applicant respectfully transverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The final rejection states that ‘DuPre’ et al. lacks a plurality of terminals, wherein multiple first polarity connections are coupled to a single first polarity terminal and corresponding multiple second polarity connections are coupled to multiple second polarity terminals.” The final rejection further state that Greenwood et al. teach “a plurality of terminals (Figures 1, and 3a-3b), wherein multiple first polarity connections (101) are coupled to a single first polarity terminal and corresponding multiple second polarity connections (102) are coupled to multiple second polarity terminals (figures 1, and 3a-3b).” Applicant agrees with these assessments of the applied references.

Greenwood (6,590,762) appears to show a single first “electrical terminal 101” and a single “second electrical terminal 102” (column 2, lines 44-48). Figures 3a and 3b appear to show multiple negative terminals 303 and multiple positive terminals 304. However, Applicant does not agree that Greenwood (6,590,762) shows a plurality of terminals, wherein *multiple* first polarity connections are coupled to a *single* first polarity terminal and corresponding *multiple* second polarity connections are coupled to *multiple* second polarity terminals.

As stated above, Applicant does not agree with the characterization of first and second polarity connections in the present Office Action. Nevertheless, assume for the sake of argument that Figures 3a and 3b of Greenwood (6,590,762) show multiple second polarity connections coupled to multiple second polarity terminals. *Applicant notes that first polarity connections and second polarity connections appear to be the same in Greenwood as illustrated in Figure 1 and Figures 3a and 3b.*

Therefore if Greenwood shows multiple second polarity connections coupled to multiple second polarity terminals, then Greenwood also shows multiple first polarity connections coupled to multiple first polarity terminals. In the same way, if for the sake of argument, Greenwood shows multiple second polarity connections coupled to a single second polarity terminal, then Greenwood also shows multiple first polarity connections coupled to a single first polarity terminal.

In contrast, claim 1 includes a plurality of terminals, wherein multiple first polarity connections are coupled to a single first polarity terminal and corresponding multiple second polarity connections are coupled to multiple second polarity terminals.

Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not show every element of claim 1, a 35 USC § 103(a) rejection is not supported by the references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to claim 1. Additionally, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to the remaining claims that depend from claim 1 as depending on an allowable base claim.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda et al. (U.S. 6,351,369) in view of DuPre' et al. (U.S. 5,880,925) and Greenwood. Applicant respectfully submits that the additional references of Kuroda and Hanson fail to cure the rejection based on DuPre' and Greenwood for at least the reasons outlined above.

Similar to claim 1 as discussed above, independent claim 18 includes a plurality of terminals, wherein multiple first polarity connections are coupled to a single first polarity terminal and corresponding multiple second polarity connections are coupled to multiple second polarity terminals.

For at least the reasons discussed under claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim

18 is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to claim 18. Likewise, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to the remaining claims that depend from claim 18 as depending on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

The applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney at (612) 373-6944 to discuss any questions which may remain with respect to the present application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

AARON J. STEYSKAL ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6944

Date 8-26-06

By


David C Peterson
Reg. No. 47,857

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 28th day of August 2006.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

